NOVEMBER 1956

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 8

7

MARXIAN SOCIALISM

PAUL M. SWEEZY

SIC TRANSIT

ALEXANDER L. CROSBY

Henry Pratt Fairchild
1880-1956

ITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME EIGHT NUMBER SEVEN NOVEMBER 1956

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Contribution of the 1956 Campaign 225
MARXIAN SOCIALISM by Paul M. Sweezy 227
HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, 1880-1956
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy 242
SIC TRANSIT by Alexander L. Crosby 244
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 248

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1956, by Monthly Review, Inc.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICE: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.
MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York. Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$3.00 (foreign, $3.50); two years—$5.00 (foreign, $6.00).
By 1st class mail — United States $5; everywhere else $6.
By air mail — No. America $7; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

All MR readers, we are sure, will share our sense of grief and loss at the death of Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild, Chairman of Monthly Review Associates from its founding. Elsewhere in this issue we publish an all-too-brief tribute to one of the best friends MR will ever have.

MR readers are paying another kind of tribute to Professor Fairchild in their response to the 1956 Associates appeal which went out over his signature in September. Contributions are still running ahead of previous years, and we are confident that when the final results are in they will show new highs both in the number of persons joining the Associates and in the amount contributed. Hal Fairchild would have been enormously pleased. If you want to show your appreciation for his long and faithful services to the American progressive movement, there could be no more appropriate way than a special donation to the Associates which he led for the first years of its existence.

While we are on the subject of the Associates, let us remind you again that this year's program will consist of a series of six lectures in January, February, and March on American capitalism by Paul Sweezy. Arrangements as to time, place, and so on will be announced in next month's issue. Associates, as always, will be admitted free, but we hope that they will not confine their activities to attending the lectures. The series has a serious educational purpose, and its success will depend very largely on the number of

(continued on inside back cover)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE 1956 CAMPAIGN

When the Supreme Court announced its decision outlawing segregation in the public schools more than two years ago, it was widely assumed, even in left-wing circles, that genuine racial equality was at last in sight. It has not proved to be so.

Progress has been made in the border states, but the hard-core South remains solidly segregated. Moreover, what had once seemed a snowballing movement in favor of equality has been slowed down everywhere, stopped in some places, and actually reversed in all too many others. The NAACP, chief organizational weapon in the fight for equality, has been outlawed in some parts of the South and will certainly be hit even harder in the months ahead. Southern legislatures are already passing laws openly defying the Supreme Court ruling. And the organized racist movement, mainly in the form of the White Citizens Councils, is rapidly growing in strength and boldness.

Meanwhile, the two major political parties, following what are supposed to be smart political tactics, have pusillanimously straddled the racial issue, with the inevitable result of weakening the Negro movement and encouraging the lawlessness of the pro-segregation extremists. Eisenhower enhances his reputation as a middle-of-the-roader by trying his best to steer a straight course between legality and illegality, between decency and degradation, between right and wrong. And Stevenson doesn't dare permit himself anything like the positive stand for racial equality that Truman adopted as long ago as 1948 when the issue was much less burning.

It is not a pretty picture that presents itself in these closing days of the 1956 electoral campaign, and it gives the lie to all the slick talk about national health and progress, either already achieved or soon to come. The cruel deception of American politics has never been more devastatingly revealed. And yet there is certainly no cause for despair. The recent incidents in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas have shown magnificent spirit on the part of Negroes, and many white people—perhaps more than we had a right to expect—have behaved decently and courageously. World opinion—the opinion of a predominantly colored world, let us never forget—has reacted with loathing and anger to some of the scenes that have been enacted in the United States and fully reported all over the globe. All the elements for a renewed and expanded movement for equality are present—determination and militancy on the part of Negroes, sym-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pathy among white Americans, ardent support from world opinion. What the movement lacks is organization, self-consciousness, and a firm understanding of the nature of the problem and the requirements of the struggle ahead.

The experience of these last two years should prove to be a powerful teacher.

Who can now doubt that gradualism as interpreted by the courts is in practice the granting of time to the racists to organize to flout the law? If the Supreme Court had firmly insisted from the beginning on desegregation *everywhere and according to a uniform schedule based solely on a consideration of physical and administrative problems,* we would be much further along than we are today and the obstacles ahead would be much less menacing. This, surely, is the first and most obvious lesson of the recent setbacks.

Who can doubt that new organizational forms and new methods of carrying on the fight for equality must be found? The NAACP has borne the brunt of the struggle up to now, and it has performed magnificently. But the NAACP is by intent and tradition confined to the legal field, whereas the battleground encompasses many fronts. The need is increasingly making itself felt for a genuine mass organization, enlisting in its ranks far more than the 300,000 members belonging to the NAACP (hardly two percent of the total Negro population), and employing all legitimate techniques of pressure and political warfare open to it. This does not mean, of course, that the NAACP has no role to play or that the functions it performs can be neglected. But it does mean that the problem now facing us has grown much wider and deeper than the NAACP can cope with, and that organizational forms adequate to provide a solution have yet to be found.

Finally, there is one other lesson that recent events have dramatically emphasized: our present two-party political system is specially designed to frustrate, not to realize, equality for all Americans. We spelled this out in considerable detail in our Review of the Month of last April, "The Crisis in Race Relations," which has been reprinted in MR Pamphlet Number 11, *On Segregation.* If we are not badly mistaken, many more Americans will be ready to accept this message after the 1956 campaign than were before.

Racial equality is not only a moral issue—it is also the issue on which the bi-partisan conspiracy to keep all basic issues out of American politics will eventually founder. By hastening the day, the 1956 campaign will make its one and only contribution to the well-being of the American people and nation.

(October 10, 1956)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXIAN SOCIALISM

BY PAUL M. SWEEZY

This is a slightly revised text of a speech delivered at the University of New Hampshire on May 22, 1956. For the background, see Notes from the Editors in the July-August issue.

Since the speech was delivered to a nonsocialist audience, we thought it would be more appropriate if it were published in a nonsocialist periodical: most Americans, we reasoned, have very little idea what Marxian socialism is all about, and it would be useful to make generally available a brief description by one who has studied the subject and believes in the general validity of Marxian theory. With this in mind, we submitted the manuscript to *Harper's*. The first response was a printed rejection slip. We requested an explanation, and in his reply, John Fischer, editor-in-chief, unwittingly revealed some of the deeply rooted prejudices and preconceptions which we American socialists must learn to overcome if we are ever to get our message before the American people. It seems worthwhile, therefore, to quote his letter in full (Mr. Fischer was notified under date of June 25, 1956, that we would feel free to quote him in print unless he objected, and we have had no word from him since). The last paragraph, it should be understood, refers to a query from Sweezy as to whether *Harper's* would be willing to consider an article on the subject of militarism and the American economy. Here is the text of Mr. Fischer's letter, dated June 20, 1956:

Dear Mr. Sweezy:

We try to judge each manuscript on what seems to us to be its merits. If a cannibal submitted a manuscript in defense of cannibalism which was witty, entertaining, soundly based on fact, and persuasive, we very probably would publish it.

On the other hand, I feel that there are strong arguments against cannibalism, and the writer in question probably would have to be extraordinarily persuasive in order to sell me his case. In similar fashion, most Marxian writing I have seen strikes me as neurotic nonsense, and phenomenally dull to boot. I wouldn't want to close the door on any manuscript simply because the author happened to be a Marxian; but I suspect that if he were capable of writing wise, interesting, and factually sound prose, he would soon cease to be a Marxian.

As I remember the manuscript which you mentioned in your letter of June 17, it was a pretty dull and abstract venture into political theory. If your manuscript had dealt with the theory of the Republican party or the Democratic party in the same way, we would have rejected it just as quickly, because we don't believe that many people would buy a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

magazine in order to get a long dissertation on political theory. In addition—if I remember rightly—you totally ignored some of the relevant basic facts about Marxian socialism and much of the remaining argument seemed to me to be far removed from reality.

To answer your final query, it is unlikely that we would use an article on "Militarism and the American Economy" no matter what point of view it might be written from, simply because the subject is inherently difficult to make interesting. In your case, furthermore, you would have to overcome a strong prejudice: that is, until convinced otherwise, I am inclined to believe that no Marxian really knows much about the American economy. Indeed, I suspect that any discussion of Marxianism in terms of economics is beside the point; a psychiatric or theological approach is likely to be more fruitful.

Sincerely,
/s/ John Fischer

We publish this letter not, of course, in any sense as a criticism of Mr. Fischer or *Harper's* (they have, after all, the right to print or reject whatever they choose), but as an indication of the criteria currently being used by even highly intelligent American intellectuals in judging the work of Marxist writers and scholars.—THE EDITORS

Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is not my habit to read prepared lectures, and I would prefer not to do it tonight. In view of the extraordinary publicity which has surrounded this event, however, I could not refuse the request of the press and wire services for an advance text. And in view of the no less extraordinary interest which certain official quarters have in the past shown in whatever I happen to say at the University of New Hampshire, I think it may be wisest to stick to the text so that at any rate there need be no disagreement about what I am saying tonight.

First, let me say that I am very happy to be here at the University of New Hampshire again. For several years up to and including 1954, it was my privilege and pleasure to come here every spring to lecture in the humanities course and to participate in less formal student and faculty discussions. Due to circumstances over which neither I nor anyone here at the University had any control, these visits were interrupted—to my loss and regret. I hope tonight's meeting marks the renewal of an association which I have always found both enjoyable and fruitful.

But there is another reason why I am glad to be here tonight. Through no virtue (or fault) of mine, my appearance on the campus at this time has become a clear test of the quality of academic freedom that exists at the University of New Hampshire. Academic freedom, let me remind you, is not, at bottom, a matter of my freedom to speak my mind. That freedom, I am glad to say, I still have;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and nothing has yet prevented me from making use of it. Academic freedom is fundamentally the freedom of the academic community to employ or otherwise bring before it anyone whose ideas and opinions it may think of interest or importance. It is a part, and a very important part, of the freedom of the sovereign people to educate itself for the responsibility of governing, and as such it is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The essence of the matter was well stated by America's greatest civil libertarian, Alexander Meiklejohn, when he recently told a Congressional Committee that

> in the field of public discussion, when citizens and their fellow thinkers "peaceably assemble" to listen to a speaker, whether he be American or foreign, conservative or radical, safe or dangerous, the First Amendment is not in the first instance concerned with the "right" of the speaker to say this or that. It is concerned with the authority of the hearers to meet together, to discuss, and to hear discussed by speakers of their own choice, whatever they may deem worthy of their consideration.

If for any reason this meeting had been prevented from taking place, it would have been *your* authority and *your* freedom that would have been abridged and violated. The fact that it is taking place should prove to the people of New Hampshire that you still have and mean to use that authority and that freedom to hear "whatever you deem worthy of your consideration." I am not now concerned to thank anyone for arranging this meeting and inviting me to address it; but I am very definitely concerned to congratulate those who have been responsible—particularly the members of the short-lived Committee for Academic Freedom and of the Senior Skulls Society—for fighting the matter through and thus proving beyond any doubt that academic freedom is still alive at our state university.

What Is Marxism?

I turn now to our topic for this evening, and I think perhaps the best way to proceed is to try to answer the question: What is Marxism?

Marxism is a body of ideas about the nature of the universe, of man, of society, and of history. It bears the name of Karl Marx, a German who was born in 1818 and died in 1883, and who lived the latter half of his life in London. Marx was a man of prodigious learning and enormously powerful intellect, one of the greatest thinkers not only of the nineteenth century but of all recorded history.

Marx combined in his system of ideas the realistic philosophy of the English and French Enlightenment, the comprehensive and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dynamic point of view of the German idealists and particularly of Hegel, and the hardheaded analysis of the capitalist economy which we owe to the great British classical economists. The result was a brilliant new synthesis which is both highly original and at the same time stands squarely in the mainstream of modern intellectual development from the Renaissance onward. Here, in desperate brevity, are what I understand to be the central elements of the Marxian view of society and history:

The universe is real and existed for eons before there was human life, or for that matter life of any kind, on our planet. Life here on the earth is a natural by-product of the earth's cooling, and humanity is the result of a long process of evolution. In the earliest stages of society, human labor was still so unproductive that it yielded no surplus over and above the requirements of life and reproduction. As long as this was true, men lived in a state of primitive communism—cooperating, sharing, fighting, but not yet exploiting each other.

Later, techniques improved so much that a man could produce a surplus over and above what he needed for himself, and from this dates the beginning of economic exploitation and social classes. When one tribe fought and defeated another, it was now worthwhile to take captive the vanquished and force them to work for the victors. Some men became rulers living off the surplus produced by others; while the actual producers lost their independence and spent their lives toiling for their masters. It was in this way that exploitation of man by man and the division of society into classes originated.

But the form of exploitation has not remained unchanged—indeed, nothing remains unchanged, everything is in a constant state of flux. The exploiters seek to expand the surplus at their disposal, and with this end in view they invent and introduce new and better techniques of production; the exploited seek to improve their condition and therefore carry on a never-ending struggle to enlarge their share of the product. As a result the forms of exploitation change, and with them the whole structure of society. At first it was slavery, in which the laborer is the property of his master. Next came serfdom, in which the laborer has attained a certain degree of freedom but is still tied to the soil. And finally there is wage labor, in which the laborer is legally entirely free but must work for the profit of others because he lacks means of production of his own.

A society based on private ownership of the means of production and wage labor is called capitalism. It came into the world first in England and certain parts of Western Europe, not all at once but gradually and painfully between the sixteenth and nineteenth cen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turies. It brought with it social and political upheavals, new ways of thinking, and a deep awareness of the vast creative potentials of human labor and industry. Historically speaking, capitalism was a long leap forward. In the words of the *Communist Manifesto*: "It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former migrations and crusades."

But capitalism contains within itself what Marx called contradictions which prevent it from fully realizing the potentials which it was the first to uncover. The capitalist class, comprising those who own the instruments of production and set them in motion, is and must be concerned with making profits, not with the general welfare. Capitalists subordinate other aims to the maximization of profit. In pursuit of this objective, they pay workers as little as they can get away with and steadily introduce labor-saving machinery. The consequence, of course, is to hold down the consuming power of the working class. At the same time, the capitalists restrict their own consumption in the interests of accumulating more and more capital. But accumulating more and more capital means adding to society's productive capacity. We, therefore, have the paradox that capitalism steps on the brake as far as consumption is concerned and on the accelerator as far as production is concerned. This is its basic contradiction, and it cannot be eliminated except through changing the system from one of production for profit to one of production for use.

On the basis of this analysis, Marx believed that it was to the interest of the workers to organize themselves politically in order eventually to gain power and replace capitalism by a system based upon common ownership of the means of production and economic planning, a system to which he and his followers came in time to give the name of socialism. Moreover, Marx had no doubt that the workers would in fact follow this course, and that their growing numbers, importance, and discipline under capitalism would sooner or later ensure their victory. As to *how* the transition would be effected, Marx at first thought that it would have to be everywhere by means of a violent revolution. But as political democracy spread, especially in the English-speaking countries, he modified this view and in the last decades of his life believed that a peaceful and legal transition was quite possible in some countries and under some conditions. "We know," he said in a speech at Amsterdam in 1872, "that special regard must be paid to the institutions, customs, and traditions of various lands; and we do not deny that there are certain countries, such as the United States and England, in which the workers may hope to achieve their ends by peaceful means."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Is Socialism?

So much then for Marxism. Naturally, my account is oversimplified and very incomplete, but I hope it may serve to give you some idea of the scope and quality of Marx's thought—so different from the impressions which demagogic opponents have always sought to convey. Let us now ask: What is socialism?

Socialism, according to Marx, is the form of society which will succeed capitalism, just as capitalism is the form of society which succeeded feudalism.

The fundamental change would consist in the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. Please note that neither Marx nor (so far as I know) any other modern socialist of importance ever advocated or expected that private ownership of consumer goods would or should be abolished. On the contrary, he favored the multiplication of consumer goods in the hands of the lower-income groups, hence a great extension of private ownership in this sphere.

As to the form of ownership of the means of production which would characterize socialism, Marxists have never been dogmatic. Ownership must be by public bodies, but that does not necessarily mean only the central government: local governments, special public authorities of one sort or another, and cooperatives can also own means of production under socialism. And there can even be a certain amount of private ownership, provided it is confined to industries in which production takes place on a small scale.

A corollary of public ownership of the means of production is economic planning. The capitalist economy is governed by the market, that is to say, by private producers responding to price movements with a view to maximizing their own profits. It is through this mechanism that supply and demand are adjusted to each other and productive resources are allocated to various industries and branches of production. But public bodies have no compelling reason to maximize their profits (though, admittedly, under certain circumstances they may be *directed* to make as much profit as they can). In general, therefore, they must have some other principle to guide their economic conduct, and this can only be the following of a plan which coordinates the activities of all the public bodies.

Now socialists claim that it is precisely the freedom from the necessity to make profits and the coordination of all economic activities by a general plan which allows socialism to overcome the contradictions of capitalism and to develop its resources and technology for the greatest good of the people as a whole. Under such a system, crises and unemployment could only result from bad planning; and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while bad planning is certainly not impossible, especially in the early stages of socialist society, there is no reason why planners should not learn to correct their mistakes and to reduce the resulting maladjustments and disproportions to smaller and smaller dimensions.

What about the non-economic aspects of socialism? Here Marx had a well-developed theory. He expected socialism to come first in the more advanced industrialized countries and to build on the political foundations which they had already achieved. Since in such countries the workers were in a majority, he believed that the taking of political power by the working class would mean full democracy and liberty for most of the people, though he also expected that there would be a period of greater or lesser duration when the rights and freedoms of the former exploiters would be subject to certain restrictions. As to the longer-run future, he reasoned that the full development of society's economic potential under socialism would gradually raise the well-being and education of everyone so that eventually all classes and class distinctions would be done away with. When that happened—but not before—the state as a repressive apparatus for dealing with class and other forms of social conflict would "wither away." The final goal of Marx and his followers can therefore be said to be the same as that of the philosophical anarchists. It would be a state of society in which, to quote Marx's words, "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" and in which distribution takes place according to the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Others before Marx had had a similar vision of a good society to come—a society of abundance and brotherhood in place of the society of scarcity and alienation which the human race had always been condemned to live in. What particularly distinguished Marx from his predecessors is that he purported to prove that this society of the future, which he called socialism, is not only a dream and a hope but is in fact the next stage of historical evolution. It would not come automatically, to be sure—not as the result of the blind decrees of fate. It would come rather as the result of the conscious, organized activity of working people, the vast majority of mankind. Given this perspective, the task of the humanitarian could only be to devote his energies to educating and organizing the working class to fulfill its historic mission. That, in a word, is what Marxists have been trying to do for nearly a hundred years now.

Was Marx Right?

Marx's prophetic forecast of the end of capitalism and the opening of a new era in human history was given to the world in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist Manifesto in 1848. More than a century has passed since. Do the facts of this intervening period permit us to say whether Marx was right or wrong?

In the broadest sense, I do not see how it can be denied that Marx has been brilliantly vindicated. A mighty socialist movement based on the working class grew up during his lifetime. The crises of capitalism, far from abating, grew in intensity and violence, culminating in the holocausts of two world wars. Beginning with the Russian Revolution of 1917, more and more of the earth's population has withdrawn from the orbit of capitalism and has undertaken to reconstruct its economy and society on the basis of public ownership and planning. Today, something like a third of the human race has definitively abandoned private enterprise and, under Communist leadership, is building up a network of planned economies.

But it is not only in Communist-led countries that this is happening, though elsewhere the pace is slower. Since World War II, Great Britain has moved a considerable distance along the road to a socialized economy, and one of the two big political parties is a socialist party. Even more recently, India, next to Communist China the most populous country in the world, has adopted a Five Year Plan which the sober London *Times* calls "India's Socialist Plan."

The fact is that over most of the world's surface the trend is now visibly away from private enterprise and toward public ownership of the means of production, away from market-dominated economies and toward economic planning. Only in the United States and a few countries closely allied to the United States does the trend seem to be in the other direction. Here, it is true, the socialist movement is at a low ebb, and private enterprise is very much in the saddle.

Should we perhaps conclude that Marx was right for the rest of the world but wrong for the United States? Are we the great exception? Or are we merely lagging somewhat behind in a movement which eventually will be as universal as Marx predicted it would?

These are crucial questions, especially for us Americans. In what time remains to me, I shall attempt to indicate some possible answers.

There is one respect, and it is an important one, in which Marx was certainly wrong. As I noted earlier, he expected socialism to come first in the most advanced industrial countries. It did not. For reasons having to do with the late 19th- and early 20th-century development of relations between the advanced countries and the colonial and semi-colonial backward countries, the revolutionary move-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment grew more rapidly and had more opportunities in the backward than in the advanced regions. When the capitalist system was wracked by the destruction and disasters of the two world wars, it broke at its weakest points not at its strongest. Socialism came first to the Tsarist Empire, and spread from there to Eastern Europe and China.

This has, of course, meant that the early stages of the development of socialism have been very different from what Marx foresaw.

The new order could not build directly on the achievements of the old. It had no developed industrial base, no educated and trained labor force, no political democracy. It had to start from scratch and work under conditions of utmost difficulty.

Many people, including Marxists, expected socialism to proceed at once, or at any rate within a short time, to achieve its great goals: an economy of abundance, increasing democracy and freedom for the workers, a richer life for all. It could have happened that way if Britain, Germany, and the United States had been the first great socialist countries. But it could not possibly happen that way in backward Russia standing alone for a whole generation. The industrial base had to be built, and that meant belt-tightening. The Russians had no traditions of democracy and civil liberty, and under the difficult conditions of the '20s and '30s it was natural that a new police state should arise on the foundations of the old Tsarist police state. Moreover, like all police states this one committed excesses and horrors which had little if anything to do with the central tasks of construction the regime had set itself.

Under these circumstances, socialism in practice had little attraction for the people of the advanced countries. The standard of living of those living under it remained abysmally low, and political conduct, both among leaders and between leaders and people, often seemed closer to oriental despotism than to enlightened socialism. It was widely assumed in the West either that the Soviet Union was not socialist at all, or that socialism had been tried and failed.

In the underdeveloped countries, however, the USSR made a very different impression. They saw rapid economic advance, a vast process of popular education, some improvement in living standards—and never having experienced democracy themselves, they hardly noticed its absence in Russia. Communism was imposed on Eastern Europe by the Red Army chasing Hitler back to Berlin, but in China it was the product of a great popular revolution. And it is now expanding its influence throughout the underdeveloped regions of the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Competition of the Systems

The two systems of capitalism and socialism exist side by side in the world today. They are competing for the support and emulation of the backward and uncommitted countries. They are also competing in terms of absolute performance. How will this contest turn out? Will those now in the capitalist camp remain there? Or will they tend to join the socialist camp as time goes on? And finally, what about the United States, the leader of the capitalist camp?

These are questions which every serious person in the world is asking today. I predict that they will be increasingly the center of attention in the years and decades ahead.

The answers, I think, will depend very largely on the relative success of the two systems in the following fields: production and income, education, and liberty. I believe that socialism will win out in this great world-shaking contest, and I am going to conclude my talk by trying to give you some of the reasons why I hold this view. I should add perhaps that I don't expect you to agree with me at this stage of the game. The decisive forces and trends are still operating for the most part below the surface, and it will be some time yet before they can be seen and evaluated by all. But I hope that I may succeed in making you *think* seriously about these matters. It is, I believe, important that Americans should be put on notice that things are happening in the world, and will increasingly happen, which contradict their established thought patterns and expectations. You may not believe me yet, but at any rate if you pay serious attention to what I say you should not be surprised when things turn out differently from the way you have been taught to expect.

Let us first look at the relative performance of the two systems in the economic field proper. It will be generally agreed, I suppose, that United States capitalism has been doing about as well as can be expected in the last decade. Let us assume for the sake of the argument that it continues to do as well (though I myself think a good case can be made out for the view that this is too favorable an assumption for capitalism). Let us also assume that the USSR continues to grow at about its present rate, though I believe this is likely to be an under- rather than an over-estimate. On these assumptions, what will be the outcome of the economic competition between the systems?

The answer is clear and unambiguous. Here is the way the Oxford economist, Peter Wiles, put the matter in a broadcast over the BBC last fall (I am quoting from the October 20th, 1955, issue of *The Listener,* weekly publication of the BBC):

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps the most important fact in all modern economics is that the rate of growth of productivity is higher in the Soviet Union than in any important free country at the period of its maximum development, let alone now. That is, whether we take roughly comparable circumstances or the present circumstances, the Soviet superiority remains. The best performance by a large non-Communist economy for a long period together appears to be that of Japan: between 1912 and 1937 she grew by about 3 percent per annum. The Soviet economy grew by about 5½ percent per annum before the war and by about 7½ percent since 1948. For mining and manufacturing alone . . . the figures are: Japan 7 percent, USSR 12 percent.

We see that the overwhelming Communist superiority in industry alone leads to a great overall superiority (in the whole national income). The effect of compound interest is very great over a few decades. Thus, growing 3 percent per annum faster than the United States, the USSR could catch up from a starting point of half the United States national income per head in 23 years.

These facts are not widely known in the United States, I am sorry to say, but there is no doubt about their authenticity. Thus, for example, the *New York Times* of a few days ago (May 18) quotes Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the British Labor Party and himself a trained economist, as having told the Convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, meeting in Atlantic City, that "Soviet national income was going up 10 percent a year, double the United States rate." If this continues, the USSR will overtake and surpass the United States *in per capita income* in about four more Five Year Plans.

Let us turn now to our second field of competition, education. Developments here are no less startling, and unfortunately no better known, than in the field of economics proper. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I can do no better than quote from what former Senator William Benton of Connecticut wrote in the *New York Times* Sunday magazine section on April 1, 1956, after a trip to the Soviet Union to study educational developments there:

> What is it that most impresses the foreign observer about the Soviet school system? In less than forty years, starting with a population about 50 percent illiterate, the Soviets have built a seven-year primary school system rivalling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment.
>
> Since World War II, the Soviet secondary school system has mushroomed amazingly. By 1960 the basic ten-year school is to be compulsory everywhere. In spite of acute labor shortages, all children are to be kept in school from 7 to 17. Every Russian

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> youngster is to be given an education—a Communist education, of course, but comparable in its high standards of study and learning to an English public school or a French lycee. . . .
>
> Further, the USSR is on the road to surpassing the US both in the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level. Indeed, when high level extension-correspondence students are included, the Soviet total of 4,300,000 enrolled in 1955 is already 70 percent over our 2,700,000. The Soviet Union offers as much training to every boy and girl as his or her talents and abilities will absorb. . . .
>
> Eighty to 90 percent of all students at Soviet higher institutions have been on state scholarships, which included stipends rising slightly from year to year. In February we learned from the Party Congress that beginning this autumn all education is to be free.

This speaks for itself, and all I would add is that the standards of the English public school and the French lycee are far above the average of our public schools.

The results of this enormous educational program are already beginning to show. According to Sir John Cockroft, head of Britain's Atomic Energy Establishment at Harwell, "Britain's output of graduate engineers was about 2,800 a year, while the figure for the United States was 23,000 and for the Soviet 53,000." (*New York Times,* April 14, 1956.) In other words, the USSR is already turning out more than twice as many engineers as the two most advanced capitalist countries combined. In science proper, Sir John estimated that the Soviet output was about ten times that of the British, and that the Russian scientists were fully as well trained as their British counterparts.

But maybe the capitalist countries are doing something to catch up in this all important field of education? If so, there are few enough signs of it. The secret of the Russian program, of course, is to train and vastly expand the number of teachers. To this end, teachers are treated with the greatest respect and are among the highest paid groups in Soviet society. The best graduates are enticed and urged into teaching: I have even heard from an American doctor who recently visited the Soviet Union that in medicine the top 3 to 5 percent of each graduating class is not permitted to practice but is, so to speak, drafted into the medical schools. How is it with us? How do we treat our teachers? What inducements do we offer to young men and women to enter the teaching profession?

Alas, I am afraid I hardly need speak of these matters to an audience like this. Whether faculty or students searching out what career to follow in life, you know all too well the answers to these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions. I will simply quote a few brief passages from a letter I happened to see in the *San Francisco Chronicle* (April 20) when I was recently in that beautiful city. It is signed by "A Math Professor, Ph.D.":

> . . . A teacher of science in the Soviet Union is reported to have an income in the very highest brackets, as compared with other occupations, whereas in the United States a teacher of science usually finds himself in the lowest income bracket; often he finds it impossible to maintain his family on a minimum living scale. . . . I have myself arrived at a certain eminence, with my Ph.D. in mathematics along with ten years of actual engineering experience besides 12 highly successful years as a professor. . . . Accordingly, I have been honored by the offer, which I have just accepted, to assume the position of chairman of the mathematics department of a leading private university on the West Coast. The job pays $5,500 a year. My son-in-law, who graduated from high school a few years ago and is now a bookkeeper, earns almost precisely the same amount. . . . Let us face the result: an economy which cares so little about its professors of science as to place them on a bottom rung is not entitled to ask for a leading world position in science, and we shall not achieve it.

It is a sad story, but all too easy to understand. There is no profit to be made out of education—not directly anyway. And it is profit that guides a capitalist society. As long as we have capitalism, we shall undoubtedly treat our teachers as second-class citizens, and educationally we shall fall farther and farther behind a society which puts science and education above dollars.

We come finally to the question of liberty. Here the advanced capitalist countries started with an advantage over the Soviet Union no less enormous than in the field of economics. And on the whole, they have succeeded in preserving their lead more successfully here than in economics. The Soviet police state certainly has an unenviable record of arbitrary arrests, trials, purges, shootings, labor camps, and all the rest—you are much more familiar with this than with the Soviet Union's record in production and education. The question for the future really is whether these are necessary features of socialism as such or whether they result from Russia's dark past, from the almost unimaginable difficulties of building an industrial economy in a backward country against implacable outside hostility, and from the tensions and fears of a world in which war is an ever-present threat.

There is no certain way of answering this question yet. I can only say that as a convinced socialist, I see no reason for despair

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and every reason for hope. I do not myself attribute much of the Soviet Union's record in the field of liberty to the evil doings of any one man, including Stalin. One-man interpretations of history are too easy—and really explain nothing. And yet there is no doubt that the last few years, which happen to be the years since Stalin's death, have witnessed a considerable change in the Soviet world, and the pace of this change has been sharply stepped up in recent months. Many of the abuses of the past were sharply denounced at the February Congress of the Communist Party. Since then, we have been told that a new judicial code is soon to be promulgated which will bring the USSR closer to our idea of a government of laws rather than of men. The labor camps have mostly been closed, and it has just been announced that they will soon be abolished altogether. Workers can now leave their jobs by simply giving two weeks notice. A friend of mine who is a professor at Stanford University happened to be in Moscow on his way to India in December and again in March on his way back. He reports that the whole atmosphere, and especially the attitude toward foreigners, had undergone a startling change for the better.

Is all this merely a temporary aberration, or is it the beginning of a new trend toward liberalization in the socialist countries? I myself firmly believe the latter to be the correct interpretation. And I think the cause is clear: the forced march in the economic sphere is drawing to a close; Soviet citizens now constitute one of the best educated publics in the world; the achievement of atomic parity with the United States has given them an unprecedented feeling of security; and the Soviet Union, far from being isolated, is now surrounded by friends and allies, including the most populous country in the world. The preconditions for internal relaxation and liberalization are there. What is especially encouraging to all who love liberty, and that certainly includes the vast majority of the world's socialists, is that relaxation and liberalization *are actually happening.*

I believe that the trend is here to stay, barring another war which I think increasingly less likely. In the long run, it will present capitalism with the greatest challenge of all. Up to now, the defenders of capitalism have always been able to counter arguments for socialism with the reply: "Look at the slave labor camps in Russia!" And there's no doubt that it has been an effective argument. Now, however, the camps are disappearing. Suppose all that they symbolize also disappears? Suppose socialism shows what Marxists have always maintained, that it is possible to have economic collectivism *and* freedom? Suppose the socialist world overtakes and surpasses the capitalist world not only in production and per capita

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

income, not only in education and science, but also in freedom and respect for the dignity of the individual? What then?

You may think these questions fantastic now. Perhaps. But let me make a suggestion. Let me propose that you file them away in the back of your mind and then bring them out, say once every year, and check the answers you are able to give on the basis of the latest facts available to you. I have no doubt what the answers will be, sooner or later. If I am right, it will be facts and not my arguments that will convince you. And I am very glad to leave it to the future to decide.

It cannot be too thoroughly understood that socialism is not charity nor loving-kindness, nor sympathy with the poor, nor popular philanthropy . . . but the economist's hatred of waste and disorder, the aesthete's hatred of ugliness and dirt, the lawyer's hatred of injustice, the doctor's hatred of disease, the saint's hatred of the seven deadly sins. . . .

—George Bernard Shaw, *Everybody's Political What's What*

Anthropologists can find no weapons or signs of organized warfare in the paleontological deposits of the most primitive human groups, nor do their fossilized skeletons show marks of dietary deficiencies. The skeletons of more advanced societies are engraved with the evidence of dietary lacks, the biological etchings of hunger. It can be concluded that hunger and war arrived when man had reached a stage in culture when he began to accumulate reserves, and to defend his collected wealth; they began, that is, with the difficulties man created in the distribution of natural riches.

—Josué de Castro, *The Geography of Hunger*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Affectionate Memory of
HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD
1880-1956

Henry Pratt Fairchild was born in Dundee, Illinois, on August 18, 1880. He did his undergraduate work at Doane College in Nebraska, graduating in the class of 1900. The next three years he spent teaching at the International College in Smyrna (now Izmir), Turkey. Returning to the United States, he taught successively at Doane, Bowdoin, and Yale, taking his PhD at Yale in 1909. During World War I, he served with the War Camp Community Service, and in 1919 joined the faculty of New York University, first as Professor of Social Economy and from 1924 on as Professor of Sociology. He was Chairman of the Department of Sociology from 1938 to 1945, when he retired as Professor Emeritus. He maintained his office and his associations at NYU right up to his death.

Professor Fairchild specialized in the fields of demography and race relations in which he wrote many books and articles, including *Greek Immigration to the United States, The Melting Pot Mistake,* and *Race and Nationality as Factors in American Life.* Perhaps his most widely read works were in the field of economics, especially *Profits or Prosperity?* and *Economics for the Millions.* In these he showed himself to be a staunch opponent of capitalism and an equally strong supporter of socialism. Of *Economics for the Millions,* published in 1940, the *New York Times* reviewer wrote: "This book is really a critique of our capitalist economy from the Marxist point of view. Thus, while the explanations of economic principles are complete and fairly stated, they are conditioned throughout by the author's firm belief in the desirability of socialism."

Professor Fairchild never hesitated to act on his beliefs, and he gave generously of his time and energies to organizations and causes dedicated to their realization. That some of these causes were unpopular and that his commitment to them subjected him to official or unofficial disapproval or even slander were circumstances which counted not at all with him. He did what he thought was right simply because he thought it was right, expecting no credit and fearing no blame.

We had met Professor Fairchild on various occasions since the early 1930s, but our close association with him dated from the found-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of *Monthly Review* in 1949. He was naturally attracted to this new publishing venture because of its frankly socialist aims, and from the beginning he offered us his full cooperation. When it was decided to establish Monthly Review Associates in the winter of 1950-1951, we invited him to accept the chairmanship which he was happy to do.

From then on, he never missed a meeting of the Associates board, and he chaired a large proportion of the dozens of public meetings and lectures which the Associates put on in New York during the next five years. Those who worked with him and those who attended the public meetings are not likely soon to forget his wonderful combination of firmness and good nature. He always opened and closed meetings precisely on schedule; he kept business moving, never allowing proceedings to bog down in dilatory discussion or fruitless wrangles; and yet he always treated everyone with the utmost courtesy and consideration. He was equally firm in his love of democracy and his rejection of anarchy: he was, in short, very close to being an ideal chairman and collaborator. Monthly Review Associates will never be able to make up for his loss, but as long as it exists it will benefit from the methods and traditions which he impressed upon the organization in its crucial formative years. The magazine and its editors owe him an everlasting debt of gratitude.

Professor Fairchild's activities for *Monthly Review* were not confined to the Associates. We always had the benefit of his advice on editorial matters, and he was a regular contributor to the pages of the magazine. Perhaps the last piece of writing of his to be published, before his death at the home of his daughter in California on October 2nd, was a delightful short essay entitled "What's In a Name?" which appeared in our special July-August issue. We did not always agree with him, nor he with us; but on both sides we found this a source of satisfaction rather than disappointment. Morally and intellectually, he was the very embodiment of the rugged independence which has always ranked so high in the hierarchy of American ideals. Working with Henry Pratt Fairchild convinced us, and we are sure many others, that it is indeed a quality of the highest value.

We mourn his death at a time when he still seemed in vigorous health and spirits. He was a loyal co-worker and a warm human being. *Monthly Review* has lost one of the best friends it will ever have, and the country has lost a distinguished son.

Leo Huberman
Paul M. Sweezy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIC TRANSIT

BY ALEXANDER L. CROSBY

If the capitalist system is going to stick with us, which is essential if only to provide work for socialist agitators, the Big Boys had better organize a Council on Conformity to Capitalist Precepts. There's urgent need for a CCCP to prevent some deviationist elements from wrecking the system.

Consider the railroads. Although some lines show faint flashes of the old marauding zeal of their founders, the general pattern of conduct has been alarming. The New York Central, which in 1893 set a speed record of 112.5 miles an hour with its Empire State Express, recently argued before a state public service commission that buses were not only cheaper but also faster!

Next the Pennsylvania Railroad joined the Central in suggesting that long-haul Pullman passengers would do better to take the plane. The New Haven announced its willingness to quit passenger service on its 39 branch lines without explaining what the passengers could do. Finally the New York Central proposed a 390 percent fare increase on its Putnam division, which would put a fast stop to railroading in that area.

Before discussing the underlying reasons for and probable outcome of this peculiar reluctance to operate trains, a brief historical review is in order.

Passenger traffic began in the United States on a 13-mile section of the Baltimore & Ohio in 1830. The first coaches were drawn by horses. (Although the companies would uniformly deny it, there has been some talk about restoring horses to the commuter lines. The animals would be supplied, fed, stabled, and ridden by the passengers.)

The golden year of American railroading was 1869, when the world's first cog railway began hauling effete alpinists to the top of Mount Washington. While the New Hampshire line was defying gravity, the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific were defying Indians and other fauna to join rail ends at Promontory, Utah. Two years earlier, the government had bought Alaska for 2 cents an acre, thereby replenishing the national domain after generous handouts to the railroad builders.

The author is a former newspaperman, now a free-lance writer in New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was a great time for the Iron Horse. The threat of serious competition from the canals had been beaten. Even the most ardent canallers could not promise to moisten a ditch clear across the western desert or float a barge to the 6,288-foot summit of Mount Washington.

But it was during this wonderful period of expansion and consolidation that the railroads sowed the seeds of the emotional troubles that explain their erratic conduct today. They adopted names that were too grandiose. Or too modest. Or just inaccurate.

Very few lines were content to be called exactly what they were. One such was the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific—which actually goes to all of those places. Not so with the Missouri Pacific, linking St. Louis and Pueblo. The Colorado town is 1,553 miles from the smell of ocean spray. The Texas and Pacific gives up at El Paso, and the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific halts at Denver.

The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway, better known as the Frisco Lines, is no such thing. It used to end at Quanah, Texas, just across the Red River from Oklahoma. Then it absorbed another pretender: the Quanah, Acme and Pacific Railroad, which carried the Frisco freights 119 miles into the Panhandle but nowhere near the city that hates to be called Frisco. To give credit for honest aspirations, the Frisco once bought thousands of acres in New Mexico and Arizona for a right of way. These holdings are now being scrutinized for oil and uranium, the basic foods of the century.

Some of the littlest railroads dreamed up some of the biggest names, perhaps to work a magic that would stir the blood of potential investors. The Alabama Central has a 9-mile route between Jasper and Marigold—nothing else. The East Tennessee and Western North Carolina line runs 11 miles from Johnson City, Tennessee, to Obrien, Tennessee, without pausing for an apostrophe. Another 11-miler is the New Jersey, Indiana and Illinois Railroad, the lifeline between South Bend and Pine, Indiana.

In a different category are the names that are inaccurate with no obvious intent to make the railroad seem vastly larger than it is. For instance, the Lackawanna Railroad runs from New York City to Buffalo. If you want to go to Lackawanna, which is a few miles south of Buffalo, you take a bus. The Pittsburgh and Shawmut is a respectable 88-mile line that begins at Freeport Junction, some 25 miles from Pittsburgh, and extends to Brockway in the northeast, six miles from the hamlet of Shawmut. Shrinkage, no doubt.

The Akron, Canton and Youngstown Railroad runs west from Akron instead of going southeast to reach Canton and Youngstown. This may have been a surveyor's error. The Toledo, Peoria and Western does not serve Toledo, which is served by the Ann Arbor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Railroad, which—puckishly—does serve Ann Arbor. The Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis could correctly be called the Nashville, Chattanooga and Paducah, but it would be more in the spirit of railroading to make it the Nashville, Chattanooga and Seattle.

Finally we have the big roads that have outdistanced their names —the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, the Illinois Central, the Western Maryland, the Louisville and Nashville, and others.

As any psychoanalyst could tell any recumbent railroad proprietor, trying to operate under a name that has no relationship to reality will cause emotional disturbances. Put an elevator operator in a 6-story building with a floor indicator that goes to 40 stories and before long you'll have either a hopeless neurotic or a hopeless corpse. Put the same fellow in a 40-story tower with only a 6-floor indicator and he'll become seriously disturbed.

The pattern of unreality is confirmed by maps in the timetables. The railroads customarily enlarge the states in their territory and shrink all others. Thus the Lackawanna shows Pennsylvania three times wider than Ohio, while the Atlantic Coast Line makes Georgia wider than Pennsylvania. The Maine Central draws Maine five times the width of New Hampshire and the Boston and Maine retaliates with a New Hampshire twice as broad as Maine. Track straightening is further evidence of delusion. The record is held by the Chicago and Northwestern, which denies any curvature in its 437 miles between Chicago and Dunlap, Iowa.

Oldfashioned knavery is manifested by omitting or sabotaging competing routes. The Pennsy map reveals that one can also travel between Chicago and New York on something called NYC, but only via Detroit. According to the Pennsy, nobody but the Pennsy serves Cleveland and Erie.

The NYC, in one of the most awesome wrecking jobs since the German retreat from the Soviet Union, has uprooted nearly every mile of Pennsy track. Harrisburg, state capital and a major junction on the Pennsylvania, is an isolated star, seemingly accessible only by canoe convoys up the Susquehanna. Although practically no railroad depicts mountains, the New York Central emphasizes its "Water Level Route" slogan with a rash of mountain ranges occupying almost all the land the Central doesn't. Baltimore is shadowed by one of these sierras and the Philadelphia hinterland is plainly the Switzerland of North America.

Underlying the nonsense and the nontruths is a somber fact: The railroads are committing suicide. They are tired of hauling people. They are weary of their freight feeder lines. Like the amateur farmer who would like to fertilize only the ears and not the corn-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stalk, they want a handsome profit from every train. When passengers don't pay off, the formula is to curtail service and increase fares, which decreases both passengers and revenue, which requires another fare increase, which causes another drop in revenue, which—well, it's like taking one more drink to sober up.

No wonder the railroads are tearing up tracks as fast as the regulatory bodies will let them, if not faster. By their own reports the railroads abandoned 31,087 miles of track in one generation—1920 to 1953. At that rate the remaining 221,758 miles will disappear by 2191.

But how do we know there are 221,758 miles left? All we have is the asseveration of a band of neurotics. The Interstate Commerce Commission hasn't done any measuring. The truth is that on hundreds of lines the service has become so infrequent that nobody can tell for sure whether the trains are still running. The Wall Street speculator who thinks he's buying rapid transit may be investing in *sic transit*.

Here, then, we have a traditional pillar of capitalism playing Russian roulette with its own destiny and with that of the system it used to serve before service became a very bad word. This looks like sheer madness or sheer capitalism or both. Speaking as one dissenter from automobilation, I wish there were enough sanity to keep the trains running. Never mind about their being on time so long as they're on the track.

Suppose 100 *men produced* 100 *loaves of bread. If they piled them in a heap and fought for them, so that some got more than they could eat and some got none, that would be competition. Were it not for that competition the hundred men would all be fed.*

—Robert Blatchford

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Patience Pays Off

North Africa and the Middle East sizzled during the summer of 1956. Local shootings and the threat of widespread war hung low and heavy over the area. The driving forces were oil production and transportation; the lifeline through Suez; Arab and Israeli nationalism; Britain's savage "war" against a handful of Cypriot patriots and her humiliating withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone; and the rapid expansion of United States and Soviet investments and involvements in the area.

Egypt was one focus of the storm. President Nasser was ambitious, patriotic, impatient to lead the Arab nations into a place in the sun. Britain was withdrawing from Egypt under pressure, leaving a power vacuum in the strategic Suez area.

Then Washington tossed a match into the tinder pile by its refusal to assist in the construction of the Aswan High Dam. Cairo retaliated by nationalizing the Suez Canal on July 26. France shook its fist belligerently, demanding the immediate and, if need be, the military restoration of the Canal to its rightful owners. Britain ordered a partial mobilization. Britain and France began concentrating military forces near Suez. They spoke much about international law, the Treaty of 1888 with its provisions for the maintenance of traffic, and the need for uninterrupted transit at all times for all nations.

Through the turbulent first days that followed Suez nationalization by Egypt, Washington stood consistently for moderation, against the saber-rattling in Paris and London's veiled threats. Secretary Dulles shuttled between Washington and London. A conference of interested parties was called by Britain, backed by France, and supported by the United States.

The conference met on August 16, with 22 of the 24 invited nations in attendance. The conference split, and 18 of the participants sent a delegation to present a plan to the Cairo Government. Secretary Dulles played a prominent part in drafting the plan. President Nasser received the delegation, but refused to accept the plan, creating a new crisis. Said Prime Minister Eden to the House of Commons on September 11: "We have carefully considered in consultation with our French and American allies what our next step

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be. We have decided in agreement with them that an organization shall be set up without delay to enable the users of the Canal to exercise their rights." This plan being rejected by Cairo, "Colonel Nasser was surely ill-advised not to heed so powerful a combination of nations representing more than 90 percent of the traffic which passes through the Canal."

Economic sanctions were declared by London and Paris against Cairo. Four hundred technical personnel were withdrawn from the Canal administration—an act of sabotage calculated to cripple or end Canal service. Britain and France continued to concentrate military forces about the Canal. There was widespread talk in Paris and London of war.

Again Eisenhower and Dulles moderated. A new conference of the 18 Canal-users was summoned and after much backing and filling, produced a rather meaningless plan for the users to do something about the maintenance of effective, impartial service through the Canal. Meanwhile, by herculean efforts, the Egyptians administering the Canal were doing exactly that. There was a deadlock in this second Canal-users conference. Washington was not going along with London and Paris. On September 23, Britain and France asked the United Nations Security Council to consider the matter. The United States was agreeable to this.

Meanwhile, India, which had persistently sought to moderate the issue, avoid war, and have the matter handled through the UN, persuaded President Nasser to lay his side of the dispute before the Security Council. The Egyptian complaint accused Britain and France of actions which threatened the peace and violated the United Nations Charter. The British-French request to the Security Council was accepted by the Council on September 26 as a matter of course. The Egyptian memorandum, described by the British representative, Sir Pierson Dixon, as "an outrageous slander" was also accepted by the Security Council. The deciding vote in favor of Egypt's voice being heard was cast by the United States delegate.

Prime Minister Eden of Britain and Premier Mollet of France, after a series of meetings, issued a statement on September 27 declaring their complete solidarity on the Canal issue. At the same time, at a Washington press conference on September 26, Secretary Dulles urged patience in the solution of the Suez embroilment.

Patience had its reward when the Canal Users Association was formed in London on October 1. On October 2, Cairo announced that the Egyptian Director General of the Suez Canal Authority was on his way to the United States to secure technical assistance for the operation of the Canal. The *New York Times* correspondent wrote

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Cairo: "Egypt was reported ready today to propose that United States oil and shipping concerns take over supervision of Suez Canal development. It was reported that this was a high policy decision aimed at strengthening Egypt's assurances that navigation through the Canal would be free and that maintenance would be kept at the highest level."

On the same day, Secretary Dulles said at a press conference in Washington, that there were differences of a fundamental nature between the United States and its European allies over the Suez issue, and suggested that the essence of this difference lay in the unwillingness of the United States to accept the viewpoint of London and Paris on colonialism.

This dissociation of the United States from its less noble European allies opened the way for the front page announcement in the *New York Times* on October 4th that executives of United States oil and shipping companies were preparing to discuss with representatives of Egypt a project for Suez Canal improvement involving an outlay up to $1.5 billion over a period of ten years and the provision of technical direction for the expansion of Canal traffic. On October 7th, the *New York Times* summarized: "The idea is that Egypt would assign, by contract, the responsibility for operating and developing the Canal to an international consortium of private business interests, including U.S. oil and shipping companies, as well as private companies of other countries."

The concerted London-Paris plans to "get Nasser," checkmated by Washington "patience" and "go slow" admonitions, and complicated by Belgian, Dutch, and Scandinavian insistence upon a negotiated settlement, present a baffling tangle of interests, motives, and purposes.

Driving Forces Behind Suez

Ever since the present row over Suez began, in July and early August, we have been searching for the driving forces behind the turmoil. Our present assumption is that there are five dominant factors in the Suez situation:

(1) Natural resources (at the moment chiefly oil) clustering around the crossroads of the trade and travel routes linking Asia, Europe, and Africa.

(2) The anxious efforts of Britain and France, the chief extant builders of modern colonial empires, to shore up their crumbling imperial structures.

(3) United States expanding investments and extending trade in the Suez area, backed by a network of military bases, and rooted in Washington's irrationally implacable anti-Communism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4) Nationalism (anti-colonialism and the drive for self-determination) speaking through President Nasser's desire to coordinate the driving power of the restless Arab peoples and to protect Araby against the menace of American domination.

(5) Communism, propounded by Moscow, and widely recognized and accepted as an alternative to a decadent capitalist imperialism.

There is a sixth factor, hard to pin down or to evaluate—a world-wide fear of war and yearning for peaceful solutions of international entanglements. This sentiment and pro-peace movement has its most effective political expression in the policies advocated and followed by India, during the brief nine years of its independent nationhood, and in the insistent mass demand voiced by the World Council of Peace. The peace demand has been urgently propounded and supported during the present Suez crisis by the peace forces in Great Britain. It has played an all-but-voiceless role in the void of United States complacency, backed by sixteen years of war-based prosperity.

Is Uncle Sam Pulling a Fast One?

All through August and September, the campaign to cut President Nasser down to colonial size centered in London. In October, the struggle moved to New York—to the United Nations Security Council discussions and to the semi-secret moves of United States Big Business to get its hands on the Suez Canal strip.

What are the business-military-political leaders of the United States hoping to grab out of the cold war over Suez?

(1) They want Big Business to continue making fancy profits in North Africa and the Middle East. To their established concerns they would like to add Suez, run by western private enterprise.

(2) They want the Canal to be open to oil and other essential traffic.

(3) They do not want to break with Britain and France. At the same time they do not want these "colonial powers" to extend their holdings to include Suez.

(4) They want to lay a restraining hand on Arab nationalism and to block or checkmate Soviet efforts to establish footholds in the Middle East and Egypt.

(5) They do not want any immediate action by the Canal Users Association or the United Nations.

(6) They do not want international control of the Suez Canal.

(7) Therefore they want President Nasser to continue in power and in legal control of the Canal Zone until the November election

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is over and United States proposals are formulated for technical control of the Suez Canal under an authority directed by Big Business and responsible primarily to the United States Oligarchy.

These policies successfully pursued and these ends achieved, the old Suez Canal Company, the Treaty of 1888, the Canal Users Association, and the other lumber used to build the scaffolding for the expansion of United States power in the Middle East can be tossed onto the scrap heap. Uncle Sam will hold in his fist Suez (the most used international waterway) as he already holds Panama (which is second in international use). Likewise, he will dominate the British lifeline to its supplies of Middle East and Far East resources and markets. (He already controls the oil.) Less than ninety days after John Bull stepped out of the Suez Canal Zone, Uncle Sam will be wearing his boots. It remains only for Washington to lay its hands on Gibraltar in order to speak of the Mediterranean as "our sea."

Are London and Paris double-crossed, insulted, outraged? They would be wise to button their lips. Since 1945, these two governments have been living upon United States largesse. Should relief be stopped, both of the "colonial powers" would go bankrupt.

Who is Uncle Sam?

By common consent, the United States is acknowledged to be the most productive nation in the world, with the most extensive facilities for converting natural resources into goods and services for reproduction and consumption. Because of this position at the summit of world economy, the United States has been able to leap, in one generation, from military inconsequence to a military budget and an inventory of military equipment and supplies exceeding that of any other nation. Economic and military predominance, linked together through the state apparatus, give Washington its present strategic dominance in the shaping of world policy and the manipulation and direction of world affairs. In a very real sense, those who run the United States also run the world.

These increasingly obvious facts enhance the importance of a recent book, *The Power Elite* (Oxford University Press, 1956, $6) by Professor C. Wright Mills of the sociology faculty of Columbia University. Professor Mills' analysis leads him to conclude that the United States is ruled by a trinity consisting of a handful of powerful business corporations which own and/or control the channels of communication and the sources of information; a military hierarchy, based in the Pentagon; and a political bureaucracy. The members of this trinity are closely interrelated, and individuals move freely back and forth, sometimes holding responsible posts in two or even three

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the groups at the same time.

In passing, we should not forget that the same trinity took control of public life in Japan, Germany, and other key countries during the early years of the present century. In a very real sense, they have been riding the wave set in motion by the spectacular rise of modern science and technology.

Uncle Sam as a kindly old gentleman with a goatee and high hat is a figment of cartoonist imagination. The United States today is the most productive, richest, best-armed nation on earth, run by a business-military-political clique of self-selected power-seekers, and extending its economic and military control into every planetary nook and cranny that promises added wealth and power. With opposition choked at home and friendship bought and paid for abroad, Uncle Sam has become the greatest extant menace to the peace and happiness of the human family.

Birds of a Feather

Writing with regret about the passing of Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza, the *New York Times* observes: "He was big, hearty, friendly, very human. . . . He ran Nicaragua, which is about the size of Georgia, like a feudal fief. He and his sons and sons-in-law held the major posts in the country and diplomatic service and a good percentage of the national wealth—coffee and sugar plantations, sugar mills, cattle ranches, salt flats, steamship lines, airlines, many fine houses and estates." (October 9, 1956.)

Apparently, opines the editor, Anastasio's son, Luis, who is President of the Nicaraguan Congress and constitutionally next in line, will take over the presidency and administer the feudal dynasty established by his father. Perhaps he will succeed, perhaps not. "In any circumstances, a difficult time lies ahead for Nicaragua."

Turning from the particular case of Nicaragua to generalize about Latin America, the *Times* editor makes this pointed comment: "It has been an anomaly in hemispheric affairs that the strongest dictators are among the best 'friends' of the United States, and this was true of General Somoza. He went to school here and sent his children to American schools. He was at our side in the Second World War and like Western dictators was anti-Communist." The editor then adds this significant note: "The convenience to the State Department gives it little choice except to take the friendship that is offered and hope for democracy in the future."

Is the *Times* editor gullible when he associates "State Department" with "democracy" or merely propagandistic? Has he forgotten Guatemala, or has he merely overlooked the obvious fact that dictators of a feather flock together?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christmas Gift Offer

We want to increase our circulation. You have to solve your Xmas gift problem. Here's a way of doing both at a big saving to you:

For every NEW sub you send us, we will give you, ABSOLUTELY FREE, your choice of one of the following books ranging in price from $1 to $5:

THE BENDING CROSS by Ray Ginger
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman
THE TRUTH ABOUT UNIONS by Leo Huberman
THE TREASON OF THE SENATE by David Graham Phillips
THE WORLD THE DOLLAR BUILT by Gunther Stein

You may send the sub to one address, the book to another, and a gift card to each.

Send as many subs as you like—A FREE BOOK IS YOURS WITH EVERY ONE OF THEM.

Suggested order form

MONTHLY REVIEW • 66 Barrow Street • New York 14, N. Y.
I enclose $3.00
Send sub to:

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Send book (write title) ..... to:

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Gift card to each from .....

N.B. This offer ends at midnight December 31. After that our subscription rate will be increased to $4 per year.
This offer does NOT apply to renewals—only to new subs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other Xmas Gift Offers

THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley would, of course, make an ideal gift. On publication day, October 15, the price with a sub was to have gone up to $9 but, because of the Xmas season we will keep the combination price at the old rate until midnight of December 31. Other combination rates, also to be increased then, are listed below.

Suggested order form

MONTHLY REVIEW • 66 Barrow Street • New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose:

- ☐ $7 for The Great Road plus a one-year sub to MR.
- ☐ $6 for The Present As History by Paul M. Sweezy, plus a one-year sub to MR.
- ☐ $6 for The Empire of Oil by Harvey O'Connor, plus a one-year sub to MR.
- ☐ $5 for Was Justice Done? by Malcolm P. Sharp, plus a one-year sub to MR.

Send sub to:

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Send book (write title) ..... to:

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Gift card from .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Publication Date — November 15 . . . . . .

THE STALIN ERA

a new book, by

Anna Louise Strong

$1 a copy 8 copies for $5

Order from Today's Press

Box 72
Altadena
Calif.

A Reminder that

SUB RATES GO UP

January 1, 1957

We HOPE you will renew now through the Associates; but if you can't, then be sure to renew at the old cheaper rate. Why pay more later?

New Rates

1 year	$ 4.00
2 years	7.00
3 years	10.00

Individual copy price will remain 35 cents

Renew NOW and SAVE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

non-Associates and non-subscribers who can be stimulated to attend. And that, of course, is a job for Associates and subscribers. So begin talking it up now, and be prepared to sell tickets to the lecture series ($8 for the six lectures) when they are ready for distribution.

We will publish in the near future some important and hitherto unpublished documentary material. During World War II, Edgar Snow, author of *Red Star Over China* and one of the best foreign correspondents this country has ever produced, had a series of interviews with President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subjects of colonialism, China, and Russia. His journal notes on these interviews will appear as an exclusive in MR. Not only do they provide important historical source material, they also make extremely interesting reading in the light of conditions in the world more than a decade later.

Most MR readers are aware that Carl Braden is out of jail, his conviction on a charge of sedition for helping a Negro in Lousiville to buy a house having been set aside under the Nelson decision of the Supreme Court nullifying state sedition laws. The state of Kentucky is still harrassing the other defendants in this case, but a complete legal victory now seems highly probable. To a circular letter explaining the status of affairs as of mid-September, the Bradens add a penned postscript: "If you have room, we wish you'd put a note in your Notes from the Editors column, passing along our thanks to all your MR readers. They were *very very* helpful. Carl and Anne." Let us add our thanks to MR readers, and our congratulations to the Bradens for a brave and successful fight.

The letter of the month comes from a trade-union official and is addressed to Professor Fairchild as Chairman of the Associates: "Thanks for your MR letter of today [the Associates appeal]. There is little question among informed people about MR being one of the best-written magazines in America. One continues his education by reading it, and retaining what he reads. I read mine from cover to cover, often twice or thrice. Please find my check enclosed for $25. . . . With warmest appreciation of the splendid work MR is doing, I beg to remain, dear sir. . . ." Hal Fairchild would have liked that letter every bit as much as we do. If only there were hundreds and thousands more officials like that in the American trade-union movement!

The first sitting of the Supreme Court this fall produced the good news that the Court has accepted jurisdiction in the Sweezy case. The schedule now is that we have 45 days (from October 8) to file our brief, and the State of New Hampshire then has 20 days to reply. Argument on the case can therefore be expected some time during the winter. As we reported last spring, Professor Thomas I. Emerson of the Yale Law School has taken the case and will argue the appeal.

The whole MR staff has just returned from seeing Leo Huberman off at Idlewild Airport for seven months in Europe and Asia. His itinerary includes, in chronological order, England, France, Germany (Berlin), Poland, USSR, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Greece (Athens), Turkey (Istanbul), Israel, Lebanon (Beirut), India, Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, Hawaii, and Los Angeles where he will speak at the Unitarian Church on April 26th. Meetings are also being planned in San Francisco and Chicago on the way back to New York. We anticipate all sorts of advantages to MR from the trip, but we will have to pay the price of being short-handed until our resident editor's return. So if you write us and don't hear from us as promptly as usual, or if in some other way the service seems to you below par for MR (which we hope is a very high standard), you'll know the reason and will, we trust, be patient and understanding.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BERTRAND RUSSELL

the Western World's greatest living philosopher, has written a special foreword to the second printing of

FREEDOM IS AS FREEDOM DOES

Civil Liberties Today

In this important book Corliss Lamont sums up a whole decade of attacks on individual and group freedoms. He also tells the story of his own free-speech battles, including his now famous encounter with the McCarthy Committee—the case recently settled by a U.S. Court of Appeals in Dr. Lamont's favor. An exciting book that points the way to a revitalization of the Bill of Rights.

$3.95 at all booksellers, or order from

HORIZON PRESS

220 West 42nd Street Dept. M New York 36, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED